

## REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

#### Claims 1, 3, 32-35 and 48-53

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1, 3, 32, 34, 35, 48-50, 52 and 53 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara (U.S. 6,219,113) in view of Nishio et al. (U.S. 6,046,547) in further view of Nishiguchi (U.S. 6,046,787). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Takahara in view of Nishio do not disclose wherein the second surface of the substrate has a spherical configuration which acts as a lens, as in the claims. The Examiner cites Nishiguchi as allegedly disclosing this feature.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite the feature of "the electroluminescence display device being configured to project an image to one of a right eye and a left eye of a user," and amending independent Claim 48 to recite the feature of "a view finder for one of a right eye and a left eye of a user." Hence, the device is configured to project an image to one of a right eye or a left eye. This feature is supported by, for example, page 3, line 23 - page 4, line 5 of the specification and Fig. 1 of the present application.

In contrast, as explained throughout the reference, the device of Nishiguchi is basically for projecting two images to the right and left eyes of a user. For example, see Col. 2, lines 30-42 and Figs. 7 and 9 in Nishiguchi. This is clearly different than the device of amended independent Claims 1 and 48 which are configured to project an image to one of a right eye and a left eye.

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 48 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1, 48 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 36-38, 40, 41, 54-56, 58 and 59

The Examiner also rejects Claims 36-38, 40, 41, 54-56, 58 and 59 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahara in view of Nishio in further view of Hamada (U.S. 6,114,715) and even further in view of Nishiguchi. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 36 and 54 in a similar manner as Claims 1 and 48, respectively.

Therefore, for similar reasons as discussed above, independent Claims 36 and 54 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 36, 54 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: December 8, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

COOK ALEX Ltd.

200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568